



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/731.900

12/09/2003

Brian Jones

60001.0276US01/MS304207.1

4709

7590 02/28/2007
Merchant & Gould P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

VAUGHN, GREGORY J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

02/28/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/731,900	Applicant(s) JONES ET AL.	
	Examiner Gregory J. Vaughn	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/2/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Action Background

1. This action is responsive to the applicant's amendment and response filed on 11/13/2006.
2. With this amendment, applicant has amended claims 14-20.
3. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case, claims 1, 11 and 14 are independent claims.
4. Acknowledgement is made to the applicant's submission of two Information Disclosure Statements, filed 6/13/2006 and 2/2/2007.
5. The information disclosure statement filed 6/13/2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires the following: (1) a list of all patents, publications, applications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office; (2) U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications listed in a section separately from citations of other documents; (3) the application number of the application in which the information disclosure statement is being submitted on each page of the list; (4) a column that provides a blank space next to each document to be considered, for the examiner's initials; and (5) a heading that clearly indicates that the list is an information disclosure statement. The information disclosure statement has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Art Unit: 2178

6. Acknowledgement is made to the applicant's submission of replacement drawings filed on 11/13/2006.
7. Applicant has amended the drawings in response to the objections cited by the examiner in the *Drawings* and *Specification* sections of the previous office action (dated 5/12/2006). Applicant's amendment has addressed the objections previously made, and therefore, in view of the amendment, objections to the drawings and specification are withdrawn.
8. Examiner's rejection of claims 1-3, 5-10, 14 and 20, made under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter as recited in the previous office action (dated 5/12/2006) are withdrawn in view of applicant's remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

"A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language."

10. Claims 1-4, 10, 11, 13-15 and 20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takizawa et al. US Patent Publication 2004/0019853, filed 7/17/2003, published 1/29/2004 (hereinafter Takizawa).
11. **Regarding independent claim 1**, Takizawa discloses selecting text from a first document for use in a second document. Takizawa discloses selecting a first portion of text in a first document. Takizawa recites: *"FIG. 5B is an explanatory view showing a screen in selecting "transition of stock price" from the list of contents"* (paragraph 27). Takizawa discloses applying data to the selection of text and applying XML markup to the selection of text for formatting apart from any data applied to the text in the first or subsequent documents. Takizawa recites: *"When the selection operation is completed, menu data selected by the client (in this case, data indicating the type of the*

filing document) is transferred, and contents list data (contents list generation information) of the corresponding filing company data (XML format data) is extracted based on judgment of the management program" (paragraph 101).

12. **Regarding dependent claim 2**, Takizawa discloses inserting the selected text into a second document, and parsing the second document for data required for the second document after inserting the selected text. Takizawa recites: *"When the recognizing of the specific data is possible, it is first possible to designate "to insert the table after this sentence" or "to insert the sentence before the table" (paragraph 114).*

13. **Regarding dependent claim 3**, Takizawa discloses determining the data applied to the selected text from the first document. Takizawa recites: *"When the selection operation is completed, menu data selected by the client (in this case, data indicating the type of the filing document) is transferred, and contents list data (contents list generation information) of the corresponding filing company data (XML format data) is extracted based on judgment of the management program" (paragraph 101).*

14. **Regarding dependent claim 4**, Takizawa discloses applying the data applied to the selection of text in the first document to the selection of text in the second document. Takizawa recites: *"an editing management function portion which edits document data (XML) based on predetermined information input from the client terminal via the server; a data conversion function portion (XSLT, CSS) which converts the data format for use in the*

client terminal so as to match the data format with the format of the document data" (paragraph 21). Takizawa discloses displaying the second document with the inserted text having the formatting preserved from the first document. Takizawa recites: "Additionally, since the extracted contents list data has the XML format, the data cannot correctly be displayed/output in the browser present on the client side as such. Therefore, here XSLT (i.e., software which converts XSL as a style sheet description language for XML) is used to convert the contents list data of the XML format into the HTML format. Thereafter, the contents list data converted into the HTML format, and client processing software are sent to any one of the client terminals 14, 16, 18, 20 on the client side from the server 12. Moreover, the contents list data is displayed in a format shown in (start screen: FIG. 5A) (Step 4)" (paragraph 102).

15. **Regarding dependent claim 10**, Takizawa discloses associating the selected text with an XML schema file for providing a definition of the XML markup and parsing rules for understanding the xml tags. Takizawa recites: *"an editing management function portion which edits document data (XML) based on predetermined information input from the client terminal via the server; a data conversion function portion (XSLT, CSS) which converts the data format for use in the client terminal so as to match the data format with the format of the document data" (paragraph 21).*

Art Unit: 2178

16. **Regarding independent claim 11**, the claim is substantially the same as claims 1-4 combined, and is rejected using the same rationale.
17. **Regarding dependent claim 13**, the claim is substantially the same as claim 10, and is rejected using the same rationale.
18. **Regarding independent claim 14**, the claim is directed toward a computer-readable medium for the method of claim 1, and is rejected using the same rationale.
19. **Regarding dependent claim 15**, the claim is directed toward a computer-readable medium for the method of claims 2-4 combined, and is rejected using the same rationale.
20. **Regarding dependent claim 12**, the claim is substantially the same as claim 10, and is rejected using the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. Claims 5-9, 12 and 16-19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takizawa.

23. **Regarding dependent claims 5 and 6**, Takizawa anticipates parsing the second document with the selected/inserted text according to the data (claim 5) so that the text is formatted according to the data applied to the text in the first document (claim 6). Takizawa recites: "*conversion means (data conversion function portion 12c of the authoring management program (CSS, XSLT, XML parser, DOM)) for converting the XML format data edited by the editing means into the HTML format data (i.e., data format for use in the terminal devices 14, 16, 18, 20 on the client side)*" (paragraph 84). Takizawa's invention takes text from an XML document and converts into text for an HTML document, where the formatting is maintained after the text is inserted. Takizawa fails to disclose the second document as XML, however XML and HTML are both markup languages, where tags are used to handle formatting, and a parser processes the markup language to produce a displayable

document. Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to maintain formatting characteristics of a portion of text that was inserted into an XML document, in order to provide a duplicated look of the text as was in the original document.

24. **Regarding dependent claims 7-9**, Takizawa anticipates adding a tag to selected text to indicated the formatting (claim 7), where the formatting is the same as in the first document (claim 8), and where the tag used is a `<cfChunk>` tag (claim 9). Takizawa recites: *"The display information changing section 101 receives the identification information indicating an item constituting an edition object, which is transmitted from a client computer, and edit information indicating an edition content of the item constituting the edition object. Moreover, the section uses the received identification information as a key to acquire the display information of the XML format from the matching list 12e, and changes the acquired display information of the XML format so as to obtain the edition content indicated by the received edit information"* (paragraph 136). While Takizawa uses an indicator, Takizawa fails to describe the indicator as a tag, or that the tag would be given a specific value. However, formatting indicators in markup language documents take the form of tags. Furthermore, applicant's disclosure teaches that: *"the element <cfChunk> is illustrative of an infinite number of names that could be provided to the element"* (page 22, lines 18-19 of the originally filed disclosure), and hence would have been obvious to use any tag name to indicate the inserted text. Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of

Art Unit: 2178

ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use an indication, as taught by Takizawa, in the form of a tag, because tags are used in markup language documents to indicated formatting characteristics.

25. **Regarding dependent claim 12**, the claim is substantially the same as claim 9, and is rejected using the same rationale.

26. **Regarding dependent claims 16-19**, the claims are directed toward a computer-readable medium for the method of claims 5-8, and are rejected using the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

27. Applicant's arguments filed 11/13/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
28. **Regarding claim 1**, applicant argues that: "Takizawa fails to teach or suggest applying XML markup to the selection of text for designating that the selection of text is formatted according to the data apart from any data applied to other portions of text in the first document or any subsequent document into which the selection of text is inserted" and "The cited art (which is apparently a translation of Japanese into English) uses the term "format" to mean the type of markup language used to describe the data (and does not mean how the text itself is formatted" (page 8, second and third paragraphs of the response filed 11/13/2006). Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 1 as described above. Takizawa is directed to XML with formatting information Takizawa recites: "*transmit the data of this XML format to each client terminal, in consideration of the style definition by XSL, the text data of the XML format is controlled so as to be converted to the data of the HTML format by XSLT and transmitted*" (paragraph 88). Hence the style information is consulted and applied to the specific portion of text prior to use in subsequent documents.

Conclusion

29. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory J. Vaughn whose telephone number is (571) 272-4131. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached at (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 272-2100.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory J. Vaughn
Patent Examiner
February 13, 2007



STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER